

Michael Smith for QLDC – Summary of Evidence, 26 January 2023
Re-notification Stage 1 submissions: Gertrude’s Saddlery Limited and Larchmont Developments Limited at Arthurs Point

1. I have been engaged by Queenstown Lakes District Council (**QLDC**) to provide evidence in relation to transport matters regarding the rezoning request by Gertrude’s Saddlery Ltd and Larchmont Developments Ltd (**the submitters**) at Arthurs Point, Queenstown.
2. My evidence in chief (**EiC**) assessed the submitters’ primary relief which would allow for a total of 86 lots. My evidence raised concerns in relation to two primary matters:
 - (a) The effects of additional traffic on the performance of the Atley Road / Arthurs Point Road intersection; and
 - (b) Whether the access road formation could be formed to the necessary standard.
3. Mr Bartlett (on behalf of the submitters) responded to my EiC (I note his evidence is focused on the 27 lot revised relief) and I then provided rebuttal evidence. In my rebuttal evidence I:
 - (a) Accept Mr Bartlett’s detailed assessment of traffic generation and the effects of the additional traffic associated with the proposed development; and
 - (b) Accept that the proposed road design, while technically non-compliant, is suitable for the intended 27 lots, and otherwise can be addressed at resource consent stage.
4. Mr Bartlett and I undertook a teleconference on 16 January 2023 to discuss the matters raised in my rebuttal. A notable point of these discussions revolved around the road formation, and the impact of the formation on the Right of Way (**ROW**) servicing 94 to 108 Atley Lane.
5. I provide a summary of discussions, and positions agreed in the sections below. In summary, Mr Bartlett has undertaken a further design review of the road formation that will service the proposed land use change area. This redesign has demonstrated that my concerns raised have been addressed, and that, provided construction is in accordance with the revised design, the matter of effects on the ROW formation to 94 to 108 Atley Lane can be addressed. I consider that the submitted design would be the absolute minimum standard should the relief be granted.

Arthurs Point Road / Atley Road Intersection

6. Mr Bartlett concurs with my rebuttal evidence, and we agree that based upon the additional evidence and assessments presented by Mr Bartlett, the intersections will operate with an acceptable level of service.

Development Area Road

7. Mr Bartlett's evidence presented that the proposed road width was below that required under the QLDC Land Development and Subdivision Code of Practice, and the Proposed District Plan. We agree that the formation width is a technical non-compliance, and that the proposed road cross section is the best solution given the constraints. I presented to Mr Bartlett that this would be the absolute minimum standard should the relief be granted. Mr Bartlett agreed that from an engineering perspective, the road formation was possible, but did also acknowledge that there are elements that would require additional significant work to ensure that the final design meet the detailed cross section and long section. We agreed that this could be achieved at a Resource Consent / Engineering Approvals stage. We agreed that this should be a specific issue that has to be addressed at future stages.
8. We agreed that from an engineering perspective, at face value there appears to be no technical reasons why the presented road design could not be implemented. We further agreed that costs of design and construction may be a significant issue, especially if there are extensive cuts / fills that require a high level of engineering design to ensure that a stable / safe batter etc is formed.

ROW Access – 94 to 108 Atley Lane

9. We spoke with regard to the submitted design, and my concerns regarding the impacts that the indicated road formation levels would have on the ROW serving 94 to 108 Atley Lane. It was agreed that the proposed design would alter the levels at the boundary of these properties. This has implications on the redesign of the ROW into these properties. Mr Bartlett also acknowledged that the proposed works would require approvals for access and work on other party's land and that they could not have a design that imposes a condition on a third party.
10. Mr Bartlett offered to undertake further design enhancements to determine if the alignment and road levels could be adjusted to minimise or eliminate any need for work within the ROW.
11. While not typically an issue at this stage of proposal, we did discuss the impacts of lowering the road to meet #94 – 108 ROW levels, and the effect that this low spot would have on drainage along the road. We both agreed that specific drainage design would be required to ensure that water would be discharged to an appropriate and compliant outlet. We both agree that any discharge could not occur over #94 – 108 land.
12. Mr Bartlett provided a revised design to me, which I understand he will present to the Panel. It details that the road formation can be formed at the level of the existing ROW, and will not

require any earthworks to occur over adjacent land. I agree that if the road formation is in accordance with the design presented then my previous concerns about the ROW access are removed.

Michael Smith

1 February 2023